



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/634,319	08/01/2003	Yariv Aridor	6727/1H383US2	7864
7278 7590 07/20/2007 DARBY & DARBY P.C. P.O. BOX 770 Church Street Station New York, NY 10008-0770			EXAMINER THAI, HANH B	
			ART UNIT 2163	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 07/20/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/634,319	Applicant(s) ARIDOR ET AL.	
	Examiner Hanh B. Thai	Art Unit 2163	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on amendment filed 2/23/07.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 35-62 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 49-50, 58 and 62 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 35-48, 51-57 and 59-61 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Remarks

1. This is a response to the declaration filed February 23, 2007 and the personal interview between the counsel of record, Sanford Colb, Examiner Hanh Thai and Supervisor Patent Examiner Don Wong. It is agreed that the evidence submitted with the declaration is persuasive in supportive of using the filing date to predate De Bellis. As such, the rejection based upon De Bellis is withdrawn. Prosecution of the application is hereby reopened as follows. The statutory response period is reset for three months from the mailing date of this office action.

2. The following is Non-Final Office Action in response to the amendment filed on February 23, 2007. Claims 1-34 have been canceled. Claims 35-62 are pending in this application.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to 35-62 have been fully considered and are persuasive. The rejection of the claims has been withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 35, 38-48, 51, 55-57 and 59-61 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liddy et al. (U.S. 6,304,864) in view of Anick (U.S. 6,519,586 B2).

Art Unit: 2163

Regarding claims 35, 51 and 59, Liddy discloses a method for searching a corpus of documents, comprising:

- Defining a knowledge domain (column 3, lines 15-17 and lines 60-64, Liddy);
- Identifying a set of reference documents in the corpus pertinent to the domain (column 2, lines 5-8, Liddy);
- Searching the corpus using the set of reference documents to find one or more of the documents in the corpus that contain information in the domain relevant to the first query (column 3, lines 56-60, Liddy).

Liddy, however, does not disclose adding at least one of the found documents to the set of reference documents for use in searching the corpus for information in the domain relevant to a second, subsequent query, which is substantially different from the first query. Anick discloses method for automatic construction of terminological feedback for document retrieval including refining the search (col. 2, lines 28-39 and col. 10, lines 25-30, Anick) reads on “adding at least one of the found documents to the set of reference documents for use in searching”. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to modify Liddy, as taught by Anick to derive the invention as claimed. The motivation of doing so would have been to provide a useful system that can reform the query to elucidate the search space (col. 2, lines 10-14, Anick).

Regarding claim 38, Liddy/Anick combination discloses the method wherein inputting the first query comprises specifying one or more documents representative of the information to be found in the corpus (col. 4, lines 29-36, Liddy).

Regarding claim 39, Liddy/Anick combination discloses the method wherein searching the corpus comprises searching the corpus to find the documents that contain the information relevant to the query and ranking the found documents by comparing them to the set of reference documents (col. 11, lines 27-35, Liddy).

Regarding claim 40, Liddy/Anick combination discloses method wherein ranking the found documents comprises evaluating a textual resemblance between the found documents and the reference documents (col.11, lines 27-35 and lines 9-14, Liddy).

Regarding claim 41, Liddy/Anick combination discloses the method wherein ranking the found documents comprises assessing links between the found documents and the reference documents (column 11, lines 46-50, Liddy).

Regarding claim 42, Liddy/Anick combination discloses the method wherein adding the at least one of the found documents comprises adding at least the document having the highest ranking (column 11, lines 42-46, Liddy).

Regarding claim 43, Liddy/Anick combination discloses in (Fig. 3A) the method wherein adding the at least one of the found documents comprises removing (70b) one of the documents from the set responsive to adding (70a) the at least one of the found documents (column 8, lines 43-49, Liddy).

Regarding claims 44 and 55, Liddy/Anick does not explicitly disclose the method comprising tracking a level of relevance of the reference documents to the queries, and wherein removing the one of the documents comprises removing one of the reference documents whose tracked level of relevance is low, but Liddy discloses the method of retaining the reference documents whose tracked level of relevant are high (column 11, lines 42-46). It would have been

Art Unit: 2163

obvious to one of the skilled in the art to remove the low tracked level's relevance of the reference documents to enhance the language processor' speed.

Regarding claims 45 and 56, Liddy/Anick combination discloses the method wherein the corpus comprises at least a part of the World Wide Web, and the documents comprises Web pages, and wherein searching the corpus comprises conveying the query to one or more Web search engines (column 5, lines 57-67 and Fig 1, Liddy).

Regarding claim 47, Liddy/Anick combination discloses the method wherein identifying the set of reference documents comprises opening one or more files of a knowledge base on a computer in which data regarding the reference documents are saved (column 7, lines 37-56, Liddy).

Regarding claim 48, Liddy/Anick combination discloses the method wherein identifying the set of reference documents comprises identifying the set of documents used by a first user in searching the corpus, and wherein opening the one or more files comprises copying the files for use by a second user in searching the corpus for information in the domain (column 11, lines 27-36). Please note that the examiner regarding the files as reading on Liddy's "tables".

5. Claims 36-37 and 52-54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liddy et al. (U.S. 6,304,864) in view of Anick (U.S. 6,519,586 B2) and further in view of Wical U.S. (6,038,560).

Regarding claims 36-37 and 52-54, Liddy/Anick combination does not explicitly disclose the method wherein searching the corpus comprises finding lexical characteristics of terms in the reference documents and refining the search terms using the lexical characteristics. Wical, however, discloses these lexical characteristics (column 2, lines 43-50, Wical). It would have

Art Unit: 2163

been obvious to one of ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made, to modify the combination of Liddy and Anick, as taught by Wical, to identify relevant terminology (column 2, line 60, Wical).

6. Claims 46, 57 and 61 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liddy et al. (U. S. 6,304,864) in view of Anick (U.S. 6,519,586 B2), and further view of Bowman et al. (U. S. 6,006,225).

Regarding claims 46, 57 and 61, Liddy/Anick combination discloses all of the claimed limitation as discussed above, except the searching while the device is disconnected from the Web. Bowman, however, discloses these limitations on (column 2, lines 47-53, Bowman). It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Liddy and Anick, as taught by Bowman, to allow the user to refine the query (column 2, lines 1-2, Bowman).

Allowable Subject Matter

1. Claims 49-50, 58 and 62 are allowed over the art of record.
2. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: The prior art of record fails to disclose or suggest "refining the search query using the lexical affinities of the query terms that were found in the reference documents".

Conclusion

3. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Art Unit: 2163

Wyrd et al. (US 6,167,398) disclose information retrieval system and method that generates weighted comparison results to analyze the degree of dissimilarity between a reference corpus and a candidate document.


4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hanh B. Thai whose telephone number is 571-272-4029. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thur (7:00AM - 4:30 PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Don Wong can be reached on 571-272-1834. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Hanh B Thai
Examiner
Art Unit 2163

July 3, 2007


DON WONG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100